



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,520	10/16/2003	Shogo Yamamoto	2860.0721-02	5065
22852	7590	10/18/2006		
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413				
			EXAMINER VARGOT, MATHIEU D	
			ART UNIT 1732	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

C  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

EXAMINER
----------

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

20061014

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Commissioner for Patents

The reply filed on August 2, 2006 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because of the following omission(s) or matter(s): Applicant has inserted language directed to cross sectional areas that is confusing and does not appear to be supported in the specification. For instance, it would appear that the cross sectional area in the resin flow direction is that area which is actually perpendicular to the resin flow direction. Hence, the meaning of cross sectional area "perpendicular to the resin flow direction" is not clear, nor does such appear to have support in the specification as filed. Note that drawings are not necessarily done to scale and hence limitations supported only by drawings are problematic at best. Also, applicant's comment that Shiao et al fails to show that the cross sectional area of concave surface 6 is smaller than the cross sectional area of mold die 4 in resin flow direction is not understood. The cross sectional area of concave surface 6 would not appear to be an issue at least with respect to an area in the resin flow direction. Clarification is required as to exactly what cross sectional areas applicant is claiming and arguing and as to where support exists for these limitations. See 37 CFR 1.111. Since the above-mentioned reply appears to be *bona fide*, applicant is given **ONE (1) MONTH or THIRTY (30) DAYS** from the mailing date of this notice, whichever is longer, within which to supply the omission or correction in order to avoid abandonment. EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136(a).

*M. Vargot*  
Mathieu D. Vargot  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit: 1732

10/14/06